REMARKS/ARGUMENT

Regarding the Claims in General:

Claims 1-14 and 16 are now pending, claim 15 having previously been canceled. Claims 1, 9, and 16 have been amended to better highlight distinguishing features of the present invention over the prior art. No new matter has been introduced.

Regarding the Prior Art Rejections:

In the outstanding Office Action, claims 1-5, 8-14, and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Manning et al. U.S. Patent 6,602,778 (Manning), and claims 6-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Manning in view of Arakawa U.S. Patent 6,774,494. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested in view of the amendments made hereby.

As explained in the present specification (see page 7, line 29 to page 8, line 3), an object of this invention is to improve bond quality and stitch pull tolerance. This is achieved by forming a first stitch bond, and then forming a second stitch bond contiguous with the first one. Preferably, there is at least partial overlap between the two stitch bonds. When the second bond has been formed, the wire emanating from the bond head is severed, and the bond is thereby completed.

Manning has an entirely different focus. In Fig. 3B, Manning discloses a structure in which first and second bond pads 121a and 121b are to be electrically linked to a lead frame 140. Here, a first wire 250b runs from bond pad 121a to bond pad 121b, and a second wire 250a runs from bond pad 121b to the lead frame. Fig. 3B does show the two bonds to be contiguous, i.e., in contact with each other, and in fact one is on top of the other. However, since the bond pad itself provides the electrical link between wires 250a and 250b, there is no need to make the two stitch bonds contiguous. Manning clearly states this at Col. 5, lines 55-58. Moreover, here is no suggestion that Manning's second stitch bond enhances stitch pull strength.

These differences in focus, structure and method of fabrication are clearly recited in the amended claims. Claim 1, for example, now reads:

> A method of forming a wire bond bonding a wire to a connection pad of an electronic device, comprising the steps of forming a first stitch bond on the

connection pad, forming a second stitch bond on the connection pad that is contiguous with the first stitch bond, *and then severing the wire from the second stitch bond such that terminates at the second stitch bond.*

Severing the wire after formation of the second bond is not disclosed, taught, or suggested in Manning. Claim 1 is accordingly not anticipated by Manning.

Moreover, since severing the wire after formation of the second bond would entirely defeat Manning's objective of connecting the three bond points, it would not have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify Manning to meet the terms of claim 1.

Nor are the deficiencies in Manning as described above remedied by Arakawa, or any other known prior art. As the Examiner appears to recognize, Arakawa does not disclose, teach, or suggest a double stitch bond to enhances stitch pull strength, and certainly does not suggest or otherwise motivate modification of Manning. Claims 6 and 7, which are dependent on claim 1, are accordingly also allowable for the reasons stated in connection with claim 1, and further because the combination of features recited are neither disclosed, taught or suggested in Manning alone, or in combination with Arakawa.

Amended claims 9 and 16 are article claims directed to the structure of the present invention. Both of these claims require that the second bond be ". . . formed such that the wire terminates at the second stitch bond." For the reasons stated above, such a structure is not disclosed, taught or suggested in Manning, either alone, or in combination with Arakawa, or any other known prior art.

In view of the foregoing, favorable reconsideration and allowance of this application are respectfully solicited.

THIS CORRESPONDENCE IS BEING SUBMITTED ELECTRONICALLY THROUGH THE PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE EFS FILING SYSTEM ON December 12, 2006.

Respectfully submitted,

Lawrence A Hoffm

Lawrence A Hoffman
Registration No.: 22,436
OSTROLENK, FABER, GERB & SOFFEN, LLP
1180 Avenue of the Americas
New York, New York 10036-8403
Telephone: (212) 382-0700

LAH:lac:fs